

Here are the comments/questions received for the Stark Property bid site for round 4. I have highlighted the answers to the questions. Please be aware that I have the exact same information that you so on these bid sites so in the future make sure you ask the DNR the site specific questions that you can't answer by reading the Site Investigation report.

Based on the Site Investigation Report, there are some serious issues with the data (or lack of) at this site that I feel need to be addressed prior to development of a remedial action that will take this site to closure. These issues are as follows:

1. Soil borings B-1 & B-2 in the area of the former pump island were blind drilled to 5 and 10 feet below ground surface respectively (No surface samples). These two borings were terminated at depths of 17 and 12 feet respectively with elevated PID readings noted in the deepest samples collected (vertical extent not defined). In addition, with noted soil impacts in this area a monitoring well was not installed and no groundwater samples were collected (groundwater not defined and no up-gradient groundwater monitoring wells installed).
2. All of the soil borings advanced at this site, except HP-5, were blind drilled to at least 5 feet BGS which means no surface soil samples were collected for field screening or laboratory analysis and therefore direct contact issues were not assessed and with an AST tank farm on the site I would think this would be an issue.
3. Soil borings HP-1 and HP-2 appear to be highly impacted and yet no defining soil borings were completed.
4. Only one soil boring (HP-1) was advance in the area of the former UST's located east of the former service station building. With a total of five UST's in this area, one soil boring does not seem sufficient to define the nature, degree, and extent of soil contamination in this area.
5. Six AST's ranging in size from 8,500 gallons to 17,000 gallons were reportedly present at this site. No soil borings, surface soil samples, and/or groundwater samples have been collected from this area. However, based on the Site Investigation Report (August 1997) "No evidence of a release was noted from the AST's". As this area was not investigated, there is also no evidence that a release did not occur in this area either.
6. Impacted groundwater has not been defined in any direction at this site.

There are only three groundwater monitoring wells on-site and based on laboratory analytical results, all three appear to be impacted. Based on the field GC results, all of the groundwater samples collected from the geoprobe borings appear to have ES exceedances. However based on the laboratory results HP-4 and HP-7 may be clean.

Based on the data presented in the Site Investigation Report, the Nature degree and extent of the both soil and groundwater contamination is no where near defined.

Has there been any additional site investigation activities (soil sampling, monitoring well installation, groundwater sampling, etc) at this site since the Submittal of Site Investigation Report dated August 1997?

Not that Commerce is aware of. This may be a question you need to ask the DNR.

Is the Department of Commerce, Bureau of PECFA, seeking a competitive bid to complete the site investigation or for remedial action services to bring the site to closure?

As the bid spec states, propose a remedial alternative that will attain closure of this site.

Section 4 (Site Specific Bid Specification Requirements) of the bid package issued by the Department of Commerce, Bureau of PECFA, calls for the installation of down-gradient monitoring wells. Are up-gradient and side gradient (defining) monitoring wells also required?

Do you feel they are necessary? If so then submit the costs for the additional wells when you submit your bid. Be sure to specify in the description of your RAP that you are planning to install additional wells.

Section 4 (Site Specific Bid Specification Requirements) of the bid package issued by the Department of Commerce, Bureau of PECFA, calls for a hot spot excavation. With no soil sampling of the AST area, only one soilboring completed in the area of the five UST's located east of the former service station building, and incomplete soil data from the area of the former pump islands, how can an accurate interpretation of this data determine the location of a hotspot(s)?

DNR was satisfied that the site investigation was complete except for the additional down gradient wells.

Is the UST identified as #6, a 1,000 gallon diesel fuel on Figure #2 (Existing Site Conditions) of the Site investigation Report on the Stark Property and/or on the site?

Check with DNR. I have the Site Investigation Report the same as you do.

- 1.) Can monitoring well MW-C on adjacent property still be sampled? Ask DNR
- 2.) Are there any ineligible tank systems associated with this site? If so, has PECFA staff approved a methodology for dividing eligible and ineligible costs?

There is one tank that was deemed ineligible, 5 that are. No, there has not been a methodology proposed to break out the ineligible and eligible costs.

- 3.) What are the adjacent properties? Ask the DNR
- 4.) Was the service station foundation removed during demolition? Ask DNR
- 5.) Is there any investigative waste (soil cuttings, groundwater) from SI remaining on site. If so, how many drums of each? Ask DNR
- 6.) Has there been any correspondence from DNR to RP regarding additional monitoring well placement? Ask DNR
- 7.) Have the concrete AST cradles been removed? If not, are the costs to remove the concrete cradles during excavating operations eligible for reimbursement from the PECFA fund?

The cradles are still on site and the costs are considered tank removal costs therefore not eligible.

Please respond to the following questions regarding the Request for Proposals for The Stark Property, 518 West Chippewa Street, Caddot, WI (Bid #04-54727-9999-79):

- 1.) It is stated in the "Site Investigation/ Remedial Action Options Report" that the area to the east of monitoring well MW-C is reportedly a former petroleum storage area. Is any information available as to whether this reported additional source was on-site or off-site, or as to what the type, size, and contents of any storage tanks may have been?

Ask DNR

- 2.) Are there currently any USTs or ASTs being used on the property?

Not that I am aware of. Maybe check with DNR.

- 3.) Air sparging combined with soil vapor extraction was proposed in the "Site Investigation/ Remedial Action Options Report". Was this remedial alternative rejected on the basis of cost, or for the proposed technology?

It was rejected because they proposed and active system with no environmental factors present and per COMM 47 you need an environmental factor to propose an active system.

